

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/468,085	12/21/1999	MINORU MIYATAKE	Q57340	3194
7	590 05/08/2002			
SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS PLLC			EXAMINER	
2100 PENNSY WASHINGTO	'LVANIA AVENUE N W N, DC 20037		CHUNG, DAVID Y	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2871		
			DATE MAILED: 05/08/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·							
	Application	n No.	Applicant(s)				
** and	09/468,085		MIYATAKE ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit				
	David Chun		2871				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_ ·		•				
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ This	s action is n	on-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	r alection rea	nuirement					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.  Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) b	oe held in abeyance. Se	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.							
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.							
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
13)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a)⊠ All b) Some * c) None of:							
<ol> <li>Certified copies of the priority documents</li> </ol>	s have been	received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
<ul> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>							
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).							
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.  15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2, 3.							

Application/Control Number: 09/468,085

Art Unit: \*\*\*

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiji et al. (U.S. 5,953,089) in further view of Ouderkirk et al. (U.S. 5,825,543). Hiji et al. discloses a reflective liquid crystal display with light diffusing layer 30. This light-diffusing layer comprises a liquid crystalline polymer. See figure 1. Note the chemical formula of the liquid crystal polymer in column 4, line 55. The dimensions of the dispersed liquid crystal polymer particles are result effective variables, the determination of which has been judicially deemed as obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art. Although Hiji et al. does not disclose the difference in refractive index between the continuous regions and the polymer dispersed regions, Ouderkirk et al. discloses an optical film where the index of refraction of continuous and disperse phases are substantially matched along a first orthogonal axis and substantially mismatched along a second orthogonal axis. The indices of the two regions differ by no more than 0.03 in the matched regions and differ by at least 0.07 in the mismatched regions. This type of scheme provides a high degree of control in providing optical bodies of consistent and

Application/Control Number: 09/468,085

Art Unit: \*\*\*

predictable high quality performance. See column 7, lines 30 - 37. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill to use the scheme taught by Ouderkirk et al. in the diffusing layer of Hiji et al. because of the aforementioned benefits.

## **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Chung whose telephone number is (703) 306-0155. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

David Chung GAU 2871 05/06/02 Kenneth Parker Primary Examiner GAU 2871